7/18/75

Dear Howard,

In today's heavy mail there is your note of the 16th, the Kelley/Carolyn letter and the piece on NAAs which I'll read with care later.

As I expected., it having been clearly signalled, the judge ruled against 100% of the evidence and against us and rewrote the law while charging us with ungentlemanly conduct is proving perjury and ignoring the repetitious perjury. We have ordered the transcript. I expected what he did the firstk shcance I had to observe him but not the extreme to which he did it. In the end that may be helpful.

I did get what is prepresented as all the NAA stuff. It can't be but for the moment there is nothing you should do about it. The best bet is to carry this case through and we'll do it. Somehow, that is!

We have a record nobody can duplicate. Should we in the end not prevail I'll ask to be heard by Congress. But that is far ahead.

I know their backstop position and I'm waiting for it if we win at some stage and they do not appeal.

There are several approaches to Kelley without doing the legal research. One is practise, that the FBI did not withhold handwritten statements but made them freely available. (Do not specify.) Another is that they made changes in some of these statements without indicating they had made changes to the WC. Still another is that these handwritten statements have been widely published in facsimile without any such protest as the FBI now registers. Still another is that the FBI reports are contradictory to what Mrs. Arnold's affidavit says, therefore the integroty of the FBI is involved and you would hope he would be anxious to resolve any doubt on this score. Still another is that they were the agents of the Commission and it imposed no such restriction. And that there is no provision of the law authorizing it. There is in this case a direct contradiction and with the FBI's history of altering these statements you feel that the FBI's interest and that of truth as well as Mrs. Arnold's should impel him to resolve this question, particularly because you regard the inference that you would undertake to counterfeit her signature as an unwarranted slander. If you can do it without being offensive yourself I'd note that in all these years after all these facsimile xxxxx reproductions of so much handwriting no such allegation has ever been made. Perhaps that it comes with partbcularly poor grace from the FBI when there were many such pages thatbwere leaked when the FBI had the originals. You could go farthur and say the FBI had to investigate, found that some of this was done for commercial and personal profit and then once it had proven this filed no charges. (It was, naturally, with LHO's stuff and for prejudicial publicty. But I do have the reports.) I'd lean on him heavily but politely.

I'm glad you are doing this. You may recall that I started to and wasn't able to carry it through.

One of the advantages of this approach is the education it may give Kelley and others new to thisarea. If the want to learn. I do it with affidavits all the time. It helps makes a record.

When you are here again I think you'll want to go over the complete files in the last two suits. You are partly familiar with next to the last from WW IV. We went a little farthur this time. And held enough back for new charges before the court of appeals. There is the recommendation of its earlier panel, you may recall.

I am as anxious as I can be to keep the nuts as detached as possible.

Hastily,